

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
SHERMAN DIVISION

AL M WILLIAMS	§	
	§	
v.	§	CIVIL NO. 4:22-cv-57-SDJ
	§	
BRYAN OF LADERA, ET AL.	§	

**MEMORANDUM ADOPTING REPORT AND
RECOMMENDATION OF UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**


Came on for consideration the report of the United States Magistrate Judge in this action, this matter having been heretofore referred to the Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636. On June 4, 2024, the Magistrate Judge entered proposed findings of fact and a recommendation (the “Report”), (Dkt. #38), that Plaintiff Al M Williams’s Interlocutory Motion for Summary Judgment, (Dkt. #34), and Amended Interlocutory Motion for Summary Judgment, (Dkt. #35), be denied.

Having received the Report of the United States Magistrate Judge, and no timely objections being filed,¹ the Court is of the opinion that the findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge are correct and adopts the Magistrate Judge’s Report as the findings and conclusions of the Court.

¹ Nearly one week after the June 18, 2024, deadline to object had passed, Williams moved for an extension of time to file objections, arguing that the “clerk just sent [him] a copy [of the Report] on June 20.” (Dkt. #41) (filed June 24, 2024). However, Williams consented to receiving electronic notice, meaning the Report was served on the day it was filed—June 4, 2024—and the standard fourteen-day deadline to object applies. (Dkt. #24) (agreeing to “receive through ECF notice of court orders and judgments . . . and to waive service by other means”). Therefore, Williams does not have good cause for an extension, and his motion, (Dkt. #41), is **DENIED**.

It is therefore **ORDERED** that the Interlocutory Motion for Summary Judgment, (Dkt. #34), and Amended Interlocutory Motion for Summary Judgment, (Dkt. #35), are **DENIED**.

So ORDERED and SIGNED this 2nd day of July, 2024.


SEAN D. JORDAN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE